Case 1:15-cr-00073-RMB Document 160 Filed 06/27/16 Page 1 of 24

g5p2burS kjc UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y. 4 15 Cr. 73(RMB) v. 5 EVGENY BURYAKOV, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 May 25, 2015 11:25 a.m. 9 10 Before: 11 HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 BY: STEPHEN J. RITCHIN BRENDAN F. QUIGLEY EMIL J. BOVE, III 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 20 WHITE & CASE Attorneys for Defendant 21 BY: SCOTT E. HERSHMAN DANIEL LEVIN 22 KIMBERLY A. HAVIV 23 24 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So, as you are aware, we are here today for sentencing.

Some preliminary matters. First, we have, as usual, a standby Russian language interpreter, who I don't believe Mr. Buryakov has needed, but that person is here today.

> It is okay, Mr. Hershman, to proceed in English? MR. HERSHMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Unless and until you tell me, the interpreter won't be interpreting. Is that the way you want to do it?

> MR. HERSHMAN: That's fine, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So then I have been handed a document for me to sign which is called an order of removal, which I have signed incidentally. It is based, in large measure, on a document that Mr. Buryakov and you, Mr. Hershman, signed just a few minutes ago, which is called Defendant's Plea Statement in Support of Judicial Removal. Both of those documents speak for themselves -- they will be part of the docket -- but I will just run through what they are.

So, in the Defendant's Plea Statement in Support of Judicial Removal, Mr. Buryakov says that he has, among other things, received a Notice of Intent to Request Judicial Removal, which is dated May 18, 2016. So he has that notice. He also says that he received Factual Allegations in Support of Judicial Removal on or about May 18, and there he says he

hereby waives his right to have the allegation served 30 days prior to sentencing.

He goes on to say that his rights in connection with a judicial removal proceeding were fully explained to him by, among other persons, yourself, Mr. Hershman; and he says that, after consulting with counsel and understanding the legal consequences of doing so, that he knowingly and voluntarily waives the right to the notice and hearing provided for in the relevant section of 18 U.S.C. § 1228(c)(2); and that he further waives any and all rights to appeal, reopen, reconsider, or otherwise challenge this order.

He also goes on to say that he understands and knowingly waives his right to a hearing before an immigration judge or any other authority under the INA on the question of his removability from the United States.

He goes on to say that he hereby admits that all of the factual allegations set forth in the allegation section are true and correct, and he goes on to concede that he is removable from the United States as an alien who is present in the United States in violation of a certain section of the INA or any other law of the United States or whose nonimmigrant visa has been revoked.

He goes on to say that he waives any and all rights he may have to relief for protection from removal, deportation, or exclusion, and he goes on to describe in more detail what those

rights are.

He goes on to agree that there be the entry of a stipulated judicial order of removal, which is the document that I signed dated May 25, which I did after having reviewed this document that I am summarizing now.

He consents to the introduction of this statement, namely, his statement, as an exhibit in the record of these judicial proceedings, and he also agrees to assist the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the execution of his removal, and particularly in the procurement of any travel, identity, or other documents necessary for that removal. And he concedes that the entry of this judicial order of removal renders him permanently inadmissible to the United States.

And, finally -- this is a summary -- he accepts a written order issued by this court for his removal from the United States and waives any and all rights to challenge any provision of this agreement in any U.S. or foreign court or tribunal.

Does anybody want to comment or supplement my summary of either of these documents?

MR. HERSHMAN: No; it's fair.

THE COURT: Is that okay with you?

MR. RITCHIN: That's fine with the government.

THE COURT: So those documents, as I say, will be exhibits to this proceeding, and now we are going to move to

sentencing.

So how I usually do sentencing is I usually, and I will, review what I consider to be the pertinent factors at 18 United States Code § 3553(a). This will be a little bit longer than usual because the parties, that is to say, defense counsel and the government, seem to have a different take on some of the facts that have transpired here. We will deal with that after I summarize those differences as best I can and allow you to make comments about that. So that is stage one.

Stage two will be I will summarize what I am planning to do, what sentence I am planning to impose.

And, finally, the third stage, I will impose the sentence, at which point I will ask Mr. Buryakov to stand for that.

And all along the way, counsel will have the opportunity to comment.

In sentencing a defendant, following the changes as a result of Supreme Court decisions in *Gall v. United States*, that's a 2007 case; and also in *Kimbrough v. United States*, another 2007 Supreme Court case; also *Booker*, *United States v. Booker*, a 2005 Supreme Court case; and also as guided by decisions of our Second Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Crosby* case, 2005, and in the *Regalado* case, 2008, we know that the United States Sentencing Guidelines are no longer mandatory here — as we will discuss in a few minutes, there is not a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sentencing guideline -- but there is a sentence agreed to by both the defense and the government.

What courts do in fashioning a sentence in light of those Supreme Court decisions is to review factors found at 18 United States Code § 3553(a) and which, as I say, I have done before coming out on the bench today. Those factors include the nature and the circumstances of the offense or crime; the history and characteristics of the defendant; the need for the sentence to accomplish certain objectives, which are these, reflecting the seriousness of the offense, promoting respect for the law, providing a just punishment, affording adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protecting the public from further crimes, providing the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. In doing that, I will look at the kinds of sentences available, the kinds of sentences and the sentencing range established in the sentencing quidelines typically that would be relevant here. There does not appear to be a sentencing guidelines for this offense. I look at any policy statements issued by the United States Sentencing Commission, if any there were that applied; seek to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among similarly situated defendants; and, in appropriate cases, provide for restitution.

So, as I say preliminarily, there does not appear to

be an applicable guideline range for this offense, nor is there what we call an offense level. As far as criminal history category is concerned, it appears to be I. There are no reported prior offenses.

When you review these factors as they apply to this case, the following stands out: On or about March 11, 2016, Mr. Buryakov pled guilty to conspiring to act in the United States as an agent of a foreign government, in this case the Russian Federation, without prior notification to the United States Attorney General. This plea was accepted by me on that date, March 11, 2016.

Mr. Buryakov pled guilty pursuant to a plea agreement, which was dated March 9, 2016. Indeed, it's my recollection that the plea came about as we were approaching a trial date in this matter which was obviated by the plea and plea agreement.

In the plea agreement, both the defense and the government agreed that the appropriate sentence in this case is 30 months of imprisonment. The parties also agreed that the applicable range for any fine is \$10,000 to \$100,000. The parties also agreed that neither what we call a downward nor an upward departure from the stipulated sentence of 30 months' imprisonment was warranted and that neither party would seek such a departure or suggest to the probation office or to the court that it consider such a departure or adjustment in sentence. The parties further agreed that they would not seek

4 5

3

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

a sentence other than this stipulated sentence of 30 months, nor would they suggest in any way that the probation or the court consider a sentence other than the stipulated sentence.

Mr. Buryakov also agreed that his entry of a guilty plea to the charged offense authorized the sentencing court to impose a sentence up to and including the statutory maximum sentence, which is five years of imprisonment.

Mr. Buryakov is 41 years of age. He is married, has two minor children. He is, as I mentioned before, a citizen of the Russian Federation. He has reported some medical issues related to vision. He attended school in Russia, where he received what I interpret to be the United States equivalent of a bachelor's degree. He is fluent in English, although, as we said at the outset, in an abundance of caution, I have provided for a Russian interpreter to be present throughout these proceedings.

He is employed by what we are referring to as VEB -the full name is Vnesheconombank -- and has been from December 2002 through January 2015.

The probation department states that Mr. Buryakov completed a financial affidavit in which he reported assets he owns in Russia. Probation noted, however, that in February 2015, Mr. Buryakov transferred \$20,000 to a jointly held bank account in Russia and that in April 2015, he possessed a Cadillac SRX which was auctioned for \$17,000 cash, and the

\$17,000 cash was transferred to an individual bank account in Russia.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Probation has stated that defendant said he was a 25 percent shareholder in a residential apartment in Russia which is valued at \$50,000 according to the probation report. Probation also said it was unclear to them whether the \$50,000

is the value of Mr. Buryakov's share or the value of the apartment overall.

Defense -- incidentally, this will come up as an issue -- opposes the imposition of a fine and states that Mr. Buryakov has no income, earning capacity, or financial resources in the United States, and that any fine, therefore, would impose a substantial hardship on him.

The government notes that, pursuant to United States Sentencing Guidelines 5E1.2(a), the court shall impose a fine in all cases except where the defendant establishes he is unable to pay and is not likely to become able to pay any fine.

The government adds that defendant is a college graduate who worked as a banker until his arrest and earned a monthly salary of \$17,000, or approximately \$204,000 per year; and that if the agreed-upon sentence is imposed, he will be 42 years old when he is released, and this is a quote from the government "presumably with decades of earning potential ahead of him."

The presentence investigation report notes that

Mr. Buryakov objects to some information contained throughout the presentence investigation report relating to references that he is or is alleged to be an agent of the SVR. Probation states that the information it has included in the offense conduct section of its report was provided by the government and, according to the government, is accurate.

According to probation, defense counsel advised probation that, "Under the federal rules, the court need not resolve these factual disputes because the government has agreed that 30 months is the appropriate sentence, even assuming all of these allegations are true."

By submission dated May 11, 2016, the defense states, among other things, that the agreed-upon sentence is 30 months and that it is "fully supported by sentencing factors under 18 United States Code § 3553, which govern in the absence of an applicable guideline sentence."

Defense counsel also states that "the agreed sentence is appropriate even assuming, arguendo, the government's most serious factual allegations, namely, that Mr. Buryakov was an SVR agent."

The defense states that the original indictment and complaint presented Mr. Buryakov as an alleged agent of the Russian intelligence service -- what I have been referring to as "SVR," that is the Russian intelligence service -- who engaged in spying over an extended period of time in the United

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

States, and that the superseding indictment in this matter removed any references to the SVR, defendant's status as an SVR agent, or defendant's use of tradecraft of any kind.

In his plea allocution, Mr. Buryakov stated the following, I quote it here again because of this seeming disagreement between the defense and the government. Mr. Buryakov stated, "I knowingly agreed with Igor Sporyshev, who I knew to be an official of the Russian Federation, namely, an official with the New York Office of the Trade Mission of the Russian Federation, that I would take certain actions in the United States at Mr. Sporyshev's direction without my having provided notification as an agent of the Russian Federation, as required, to the U.S. Attorney General. furtherance of said agreement, in the Southern District of New York, on or about May 21, 2013, I used a telephone to speak with Mr. Sporyshev about information that Mr. Sporyshev That's a section of the plea transcript that I have wanted." quoted.

Defense argues in its submission that the government's case against Mr. Buryakov changed markedly since the complaint in this case was filed and that the presentence investigation report incorrectly accepted the original complaint at face value and ignored subsequent pleadings and actual evidence.

The defense also submitted letters. By the way, in that connection, I think just today another letter on

Mr. Buryakov's behalf was submitted from his employer, his boss at the bank. These are letters from Mr. Buryakov's family and a friend, Reverend Ioann Lapidus, archpriest of the Russian Orthodox Church, in support of Mr. Buryakov.

Mr. Buryakov's wife has submitted a letter. In that letter she apologizes for her English, which of course is not her first language, and that letter, I think, is accompanied by a Russian language counterpart.

Defendant's children submitted a joint letter in English requesting that their father return home soon.

Mr. Buryakov's parents submitted a joint letter describing what a wonderful son he has been to them and how he had been described by his teachers as naturally gifted at learning foreign languages, especially English. His parents also noted that Mr. Buryakov has two university degrees. In her letter, defendant's mother explains that she had been residing in Tunisia with her husband, who is employed with the Russian Embassy in Tunisia, but that she returned to Russia to take care of defendant's children, as Mr. Buryakov's wife had to work full-time. I believe we have previously learned that she works as an attorney.

So here, the reference I made before to some disagreement, here is what the government has to say. The government submission is dated May 18, 2016. There is no disagreement as to the sentence. They, both defense and the

government, seek the agreed-to 30-month sentence of incarceration. But, among other things, the government notes that Mr. Buryakov in his sentencing submission has attempted, I guess you would say, to minimize the seriousness of his offense conduct and has not devoted a word in his submission to "any expression of remorse or contrition for his crime." That's from the government's submission.

The government goes on to say that, "As an initial matter, the defendant admitted to conspiring with codefendant Igor Sporyshev to act as an agent of the Russian Federation in the United States. There can be no serious question that Sporyshev was an SVR agent." The government also states, "Repeatedly and over a significant period of time, the defendant, Mr. Buryakov, responded to taskings from Sporyshev. The defendant also made at least one proposal to Sporyshev with respect to actions that the SVR should take. The defendant also took direction from Sporyshev about with whom he should meet in the United States while gathering information of value to Russia. Moreover" — this is, again, all from the government's submission — "the defendant as an employee of the SVR," from the government's submission.

The government goes on to say that "the defendant's argument that the court should conclude that the government was not going to approve the defendant's use of espionage

tradecraft, because the case agent who swore to the allegations in the complaint was allegedly deleted from the case, is both wrong and based on false statements. The government intended throughout to call the case agent as a fact witness at trial and never suggested otherwise."

And additionally, the government states "The defendant's speculation that the differences between the initial and superseding indictments reflect the government's doubt about allegations in prior charging documents about the SVR, the defendant's status as an agent of the SVR, and his use of tradecraft is similarly baseless."

Finally, the government states, "In sum, the defendant's arguments about the seriousness of this conduct are meritless. His decision to make those meritless arguments, while at the same time expressing no remorse at all for the crime to which he has pled guilty, sheds light on the characteristics of the defendant."

And the government also states that the agreed-upon sentence is fully warranted and should be imposed.

So the question I would ask, in light of this disagreement, which is descriptive — there is no disagreement with respect to the sentence — is whether either the government or defense counsel wishes to have me conduct a hearing to further reconcile those differences, or is it adequate just to leave the record as I have described it and as

they may wish to orally supplement it?

MR. HERSHMAN: From our perspective there is no need for a hearing, your Honor. As you indicated earlier, we believe there are no factual disputes that need to be resolved today at all.

MR. RITCHIN: Your Honor, the government stands by its description of the facts, but I think in light of the agreed-upon sentence, which has been agreed upon by both parties, the court could proceed.

THE COURT: Okay.

I have also reviewed the presentence investigation report in this case which is dated May 18, 2016, together with the addendum of that date and the sentencing recommendation of that date, and also correspondence dated, as I alluded to before, May 11, 2016 from Mr. Hershman and May 18, 2016 from AUSA Bove.

Mr. Hershman, I would ask you if you and Mr. Buryakov have had the opportunity to read and discuss these presentence materials?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, we have.

THE COURT: Mr. Buryakov, you went over those materials with Mr. Hershman?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do either of you have any further objections other than I may have noted or you have in your

1	submissions to the presentence report?
2	MR. HERSHMAN: No, your Honor, none.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Buryakov?
4	THE DEFENDANT: No.
5	THE COURT: How about the government?
6	MR. RITCHIN: No, your Honor.
7	THE COURT: So our practice is to return that report
8	to probation, which I do.
9	It is my intention to honor the parties' agreement and
10	sentence at 30 months. I am happy to hear at this time, if
11	they wish to be heard, from Mr. Hershman, Mr. Buryakov, and the
12	government.
13	MR. HERSHMAN: We have nothing to add to our
14	submissions, your Honor. Thank you very much.
15	THE COURT: You bet.
16	Mr. Buryakov, anything further?
17	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Anything from the government?
19	MR. RITCHIN: Your Honor, the court has summarized the
20	government's position and the facts which we think make the
21	sentence fully warranted, so I won't burden either the record
22	or the court's time repeating them.
23	THE COURT: I take it both sides are content with the
24	summaries as I have presented them?
25	MR. HERSHMAN: Yes.

MR. RITCHIN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Then I am going to adopt the findings of fact in the presentence investigation report, unless there is further objection from defense counsel first?

MR. HERSHMAN: Nothing more than what we have already submitted.

THE COURT: Or Mr. Buryakov.

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor?

THE COURT: Or Mr. Ritchin.

MR. RITCHIN: The government has no objection.

THE COURT: Let me preview the sentence, and then I will impose it, just to give you an opportunity to be heard further.

I intend to impose the sentence as stated of 30 months of incarceration. As I have said, there is no guideline range here, no offense level. It appears to be a criminal history category of I. This is my practice. I do intend to impose a term of supervised release of three years following imprisonment, although I recognize that, and based on what we said at the outset, no supervision will come into play likely in this matter because Mr. Buryakov will be deported.

If there were any supervision here that were to come into play, it would be subject to the mandatory conditions that Mr. Buryakov not commit another federal, state, or local crime; that he not illegally possess a controlled substance; that he

not possess a firearm, dangerous weapon, or destructive device; and that at the refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. By the way, I am not suggesting that there is a controlled substance issue here. These are mandatory conditions.

The defendant shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, he shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on any supervision, supervised release, and at least two unscheduled drug tests thereafter as may be directed by the probation officer.

In addition, he is required to comply with what are called standard conditions 1 through 13, plus these special conditions: that if he were to participate in supervision in the United States, that would be in his district of residence. If he were released in the United States, which is unlikely, he would be required to report to probation within 48 hours of any release. He will be required to cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security, Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services in connection with any proceedings to determine his status in the United States and abide by their rules and regulations. That aspect may have been superseded by the order that I signed earlier today.

There is an issue about a fine. I am happy to hear from people on this. As you heard, there is a disagreement between the government and the defense. It is my intention to

impose a fine in the amount of \$10,000 payable within six months of release from custody. You will recall that the parties stipulated that the fine range in this case was 10 to \$100,000. The probation department recommended a \$10,000 fine. I am going along with that recommendation -- I do think that's appropriate -- although I have given Mr. Buryakov six months to pay the fine as opposed to 60 days suggested by probation.

I do not intend to impose restitution. There is no victim within the meaning of 18 United States Code § 3663 or 18 U.S.C. 3663(a). In considering the financial penalties — in this case, the fine — I have considered the factors set forth at 18 United States Code § 3663(a)(1)(B)(i) or 18 U.S.C. § 3664. Those factors typically apply to restitution, but I have used them as a guide to come up with the analysis with respect to fine, just as a guide.

I also intend to impose a \$100 special assessment, which is mandatory and due immediately under 18 United States Code \$ 3013.

Briefly, the reasons for that sentence are, notwithstanding that there is no sentencing guidelines offense level, that there does appear to be a criminal history category of I and that, as stated, there is no guideline range. In lieu of that, the parties have agreed, by plea agreement dated March 9, 2014, that 30 months' imprisonment is the appropriate sentence; and I agree that that is the appropriate sentence

given the factors at 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), including the seriousness of the offense, the need for punishment and deterrence, the nature and circumstance of the offense, the history and characteristics of Mr. Buryakov. I do think this sentence reflects the seriousness of the offense. I think it helps promote respect for the law, provides a just punishment affords adequate deterrence, and helps protect the public.

So that's the proposed sentence. If defense counsel,

So that's the proposed sentence. If defense counsel, Mr. Buryakov, or the government wishes to be heard before I actually pronounce the sentence, this would be a good time.

MR. HERSHMAN: Your Honor, simply, on behalf of the defense, we would ask the court, if it is appropriate now, that Mr. Buryakov would like to be recommended to Fort Dix.

THE COURT: I will come to that.

MR. HERSHMAN: Okay. Then I will wait.

THE COURT: When that time comes, I will make that recommendation.

MR. HERSHMAN: Premature. I thought it may be premature. It was. Other than that, no.

THE COURT: Okay. What about Mr. Buryakov, anything?
THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Or how about the government?

MR. RITCHIN: Nothing from the government.

THE COURT: Then I would ask Mr. Buryakov to stand.

I will say, the one difference, as I pointed out, a

difference between the parties about the fine, to me one of the central factors was his earning power historically -- there didn't seem to be any dispute that he had been earning \$204,000 a year -- also his relatively young age and his potential earning power going forward, so I think that that fine of \$10,000, at the low end of the guideline range, is totally appropriate.

So having considered the factors at 18 United States Code § 3553(a), it is my judgment that defendant, Evgeny Buryakov, be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 30 months with, of course, credit for time already served. That would be followed by a period of supervised release of three years, assuming that any supervision in the United States were to happen. It seems unlikely. And that would be subject to those mandatory and special conditions that I mentioned before and incorporate here by reference. A fine of \$10,000 payable within six months of his release from custody, no restitution, a \$100 special assessment which is mandatory and due immediately.

As for the reasons for the sentence, I mentioned them earlier, and particularly with reference to the factors at 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), and I incorporate that discussion here.

I would ask at this time does either counsel know of any legal reason why the sentence should not be imposed as so stated?

MR. HERSHMAN: No, your Honor.

MR. RITCHIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then I hereby order the sentence to be imposed as so stated.

Mr. Buryakov, to the extent that you have not already waived your appeal rights -- and of course now I am referring to the plea agreement dated March 9, 2016, which in fact includes a series of waivers of appeal rights as follows, in that plea agreement, which I think was actually signed on March 11, 2016, you agree that you would not file a direct appeal, you also waived your right to bring what's called a collateral challenge, including but not limited to an application under 28 United States Code § 2255 and/or 2241. You also waived your right to seek a sentence modification under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c) of any sentence that is at or below the stipulated sentence of 30 months of imprisonment, and this sentence is exactly that number, so these waivers apply.

You also waived your right to appeal any term of supervised release that is less than or equal to the statutory maximum of three years. Again, that waiver applies because the term of supervision is three years.

You also agree not to appeal any fine that is less than or equal to \$100,000, and that fine that I imposed is much less than that, so that waiver applies.

You also agreed not to challenge your conviction or

sentence on direct appeal or through litigation under 28 United States Code § 2255 and/or 2241 on the basis of any actual or perceived adverse immigration consequence, including a deportation that might result from your guilty plea and conviction and sentence.

But to the extent that there are other rights that I have not mentioned or thought of, I notify you that you have the right to appeal those. If you are unable to pay the costs of an appeal, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis; and, if you request, the clerk of court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf immediately.

So I would ask you, Mr. Buryakov, if you understand your appeal rights, including the waivers of appeal that I have summarized.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are there any aspects of the case the government was seeking to dismiss or resolve at this time?

MR. RITCHIN: Yes, your Honor. We would like to move to dismiss the open counts at this time.

THE COURT: That application is granted.

Starting with the government, did you wish to add anything to today's proceeding?

MR. RITCHIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Hershman, if you want to make that recommendation now, I am happy to entertain it.

MR. HERSHMAN: Okay, yeah, I will try again. Your Honor, we would ask that the court recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that Mr. Buryakov serve the remaining sentence at Fort Dix. THE COURT: I will make that recommendation. You and Mr. Buryakov know that the court can only recommend in such a situation, but I am happy to include that. MR. HERSHMAN: Thank you. THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Well I think, then, that concludes our work for today, and the sentence is concluded. Thanks very much. Nice to see you.